

R E M A R K S

Only two claims remain in the case, and the language of base claim 1 is very detailed and clearly defines subject matter not shown or suggested in either Quinn or Fleitman, that detailed subject matter listed as follows:

- x₁) the bandana has two generally triangular upper corner sections of generally the same size (Quinn's upper right corner in his Fig. 1 is not folded to be of generally the same size in his upper left corner, but terminates at an apex to carry his knob; and Fleitman's generally square corners do not suggest triangular corner sections),
- x₂) each corner section defines an angled edge forming a leg of the corner section triangle (Quinn's upper right corner section has no angled edge as defined, nor does Fleitman have any such angled corner edge),
- x₃) the components of triangular face area A₁ and A₂ widthwise overlap major length

extents of the angled edges defined by the respective corner sections (this language taken from cancelled claim 13), which adds materially to strengthening of the sweat permeated and stretched bandana in use.

Clearly, Quinn does not suggest this, as all tension force is concentrated at his small knob which can pop out of hole 7, in use; and if either of Fleitman's hook and pile strips 22a and 22b were used in Quinn instead of knob 2, there would be no angled component edge to be overlapped, as Quinn's upper right portion of his bandana is not folded, and he teaches and locates hole 7 spaced from his triangular edge at his upper left corner, which is a teaching opposite from applicant's widthwise overlap. Lack of relevant motivation to combine reference is also indicated in attached Exhibits A, B and C showing "motivated" combinations failing to teach or suggest elements of claim 1.

In addition, applicant is mindful of Examiner's recognition of deficiencies of Quinn at page 3, lines 5-7, and lines 14 and 15. The substitution referenced in the last 3 lines on page 4 of that Action ignores the provision or use by applicant of triangular

Serial No. 10/826,839

folds to be overlapped by the connections of Fleitman in the manner described in detail above.

Claim 1 is urged to be so completely well defined (with major differences over the art) as to be very clearly unobvious over the art in its totality, so as to be clearly allowable, along with dependent claim 12.

Accordingly, allowance is believed justifiable, and is respectfully urged.

Respectfully submitted,



William W. Haefliger
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 17,120
323 684-2707

WWH:ts
Docket 12,606